(*c*) have any representations from the individuals concerned for staying a little against them been given a hearing and consideration ?

A.—The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. B. T. Kesavaiengar).—

	Land Revenue	*Loans*	*Miscellaneous arrears*
(*a*)	15,236	725	1,290
(*b*)	2,172	208	835

(*c*) Yes. In a number of deserving cases.

Land Revenue Collections.

Q.—33. Messrs. B. DEVA GOWDA and SIDDALINGAPPA SETTY (Chikmagalur Taluk); Hanji BASAPPA and T. C. BASAPPA (Tarikere Taluk); C. R. NIRVANAPPA SETTY (Special Interests) and K. MALLE GOWDA (Mudgere Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) what is the percentage of collection of land revenue in every taluk during the past 5 years ;

(*b*) what were the punishments inflicted on the revenue officers during the months of May, June and July 1936 as a result of the orders issued in respect of collection work ;

(*c*) what are the coercive steps taken by the revenue officers as a result of the orders issued ? (Replies to the above questions may be furnished talukwar.)

A.—The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. B. T. Kesavaiengar).—

(*a*) *Vide* statement attached. (Appendix.)

(*b*) In a few cases of proved inefficiency and inadequate touring, disciplinary action was taken by way of suspending fixed T.A. and fining the Revenue Inspectors.

(*c*) The usual processes laid down in the Land Revenue Code and the rules thereunder.

Mr. Bagamane DEVA GOWDA.—The percentage of collection in 1935-36 is much higher than that in 1931-32. Does this not go to show that coercive measures have been adopted in collecting revenue during 1935-36 ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No.

Mr. Bagamane DEVA GOWDA.—Then, how was it possible to collect more in 1935-36 when the economic condition had not improved ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Collections have been made according to rules.

Mr. Bagamane DEVA GOWDA.—Is it a fact that fixed T.A. to certain Revenue Inspectors has been withheld owing to poor collection of revenue by them ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Wherever found necessary, it has been done. It is purely an administrative act and the members cannot hold any brief on behalf of the officers.

Mr. Bagamane DEVA GOWDA.—When Government insist on their officers to collect a higher percentage of revenue, would they not in their turn cause hardship to the raiyats by distraining their movables ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—The officers have not transgressed the rules.

Mr. Bagamane DEVA GOWDA.—Has it come to the notice of the Government that the revenue officers are impounding in the cattle pound more cattle than they could possibly hold and thus cause great inconvenience to the cattle ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No.

Mr. V. V. IYER.—Are zinc sheets covered on houses treated as movables ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—If they are easily removable, they are movables ; otherwise not.

Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA.—What are the several concessions shown by Government to the raiyats to relieve them from distress ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—It is a big list. I invite the attention of the member to the several orders of Government on the subject and also to the Revenue Administration Report.

Repeal of Press Law.

Q.—34. Messrs. N. M. SIVALINGAPPIAH (Kadur Taluk) and D. V. HALAPPA (Birur Municipality).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) how often have representations for repealing the Press Regulation

been made in the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council;

(*b*) what was the reply of Government thereto?

A.—The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. B. T. Kesavalengar).—

(*a*) Five times in the Representative Assembly and sixteen times in the Legislative Council.

(*b*) In reply to supplementary questions, the First Member of Council stated on behalf of Government during the Legislative Council meeting held in June 1933 as follows :—

"The fact of the matter is this: conditions are somewhat abnormal throughout India and that is the real difficulty in placing a final Press Law for Mysore before the legislature. Things are so unsettled, I may quite frankly state. I think the member is aware that in British India, for instance, the Press Law has undergone some material changes. And I should like an important law of this nature to be enacted when conditions are more normal."

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—For the last how many years are representations for repealing the Press Law in Mysore being made both in the Representative Assembly and in the Legislative Council?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Notice.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—In answer to (*b*), it is stated that an important law of this nature would be enacted when conditions become more normal. Do the Government think that conditions have become normal in British India?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Let us not discuss about conditions in British India.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—Has it not been stated in the Dewan's Address to the Representative Assembly some time ago that the Press in Mysore is sober?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—That is a separate matter and has nothing to do with the question before the House.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—Such supplementary questions cannot be answered. The member knows the difficulties in the matter of repealing the Press Law in Mysore. The matter is under consideration and a decision will be reached as early as possible.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—Under the existing law, how many presses have been punished?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No information at the moment.

REPRESENTATIONS—*contd.*

No. 20.—Authorising Deputy Commissioners or Sub-Division Officers to sanction tank remissions during *jamabandi*.

Mr. R. PUTTAVEERABHADRAPPA, Madhugiri Taluk.

Mr. R. PUTTAVEERABHADRAPPA represented that under the existing rules, special remissions were recommended by the revenue officers on the basis of the *pahani* accounts written by the shanbhogs. There was a great disadvantage to the raiyats in following that procedure. He prayed that instead of following that procedure, either the Deputy Commissioner or the Sub-Division Officer be empowered to sanction during *jamabandi*, tank remissions also as in the case of *talapariye* and *nala* remissions, after verification of the fact whether the tank had received sufficient supply or not.

Mr. G. SANKARA SETTY, in supporting the representation, said that once a remission application was made, it took nearly 2 to 3 years before it was sanctioned. There was delay at every stage of correspondence—in the taluk office, then in the Sub-Division Office and finally in the Deputy Commissioner's Office. As an instance in point, he said that orders had not been passed as yet on the recommendations made in 1934-35 for the grant of remissions in the Pavagada Taluk. Government should see that such delays were avoided and that orders on remission cases were issued within two months of their receipt. For that purpose, he thought that the jamabandi officers, who would be in a better position to know the actual conditions of the tract than the higher officers who were far away, might be empowered to sanction remissions in deserving cases, as in British India.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH pointed out that in very many cases two or three *khists* would have been collected before sanction of remissions, and once the assessment was collected, it took a long time